Dear Jim, 5/8/97

For your own understanding as well as for what you communicate in what you write it is important to know that Hoover only rarely wrote the letters he signed. This can't be detected from the originals, as what was sent to the Commission, but it can usually and easily be doped out on the file copies. So, yes, another trip is indicated.

It is probable that I have all those in which you are interested. They can be located through both Dallas indexes. I do not know if you used the larger one but I'm sure you did not use the smaller one and that may be of more value to you.

Both of those Dallas indexes are at the same place. You know about the one on names, the larger one. Before that there is the document index. It is of only two file drawers.

I think you should be prepared with a list of the documents that interest you, probably in chronological order. From these indexes you can get their file numbers. Probably most of them are in the headquarters files but because we do not know where and because some may not be it will probably be best to check them in the processing worksheets that were annotated to specify where the FBI says they were "previously processed." If there is no such indication they will be in the proper order by serial in the Dallas file.

In practise the lab agents wrote the letters for Hoover's signature but in the name of the head of the lab. So, at the bottom, his name will appeal along with the initials of the one actually wrote it, like LLS for Shaneyfelt.

You should have trouble with Shaneyfelt 35. Have to go back to the testimony to try to make sense of it. But it is not from the same perspective and that alone justified questions about what he was up to. Besides which the Commission did not print color photos, which this is supposed to be. It used instead black and whites made from the color pictures by Shaneyfelt himself.

For the reports of those in your next paragraph use the name index when you are here. It should tell you the number of the report or reports for each.

I do not remember the Jenkins memo of 11/24 but that business of convincing the public that it was Oswald alone comes from the Katzenbach memo dated 11/25 and written the day before. I think you have all versions of it.

The only closeup of the curb I have is what I publish and it was not that close. I do not now recall whether I used my own photo on that or the Archives' but either way there is a negative that can be enlarged. You can use mine or the Archives can enlarge part of that negative for you. Or you can take your own.

I do not recall the Kreutzer report on his Dillard interview but should

have it and the indexes should tell you where.

We'll have to go over the special FBI uses, meaning misuses that can be defended, of language. As on what that absence of copper means. It does not have to mean that the copper was separated from the iron core. It more likely means that no projectile caused that damage. Or to that spot on the curb.

As I believe I proved without question in Post Mortem.

Same for the NAAs. Which In secret the FBI had made and did not tell the Commission about.

But it is true that the increased sensitivity of the NAAs would have made no difference!

You draw the wrong conclusions. Neither represents the impact of any bullet as the FBI knew very well, thus the use of the language it used. It did not mean the FBI lied, which it did because it knew the truth. It does mean that knowing the truth the FBI deliberately deceived the Commission and lied to our history. With the Commission's knowing assent.

To cover its own ass.

Take your time and try to figure these things out. Do not take the FBI's word literally, as the examples of the curbstone and the clothing should teach you. It is necessary to work your way slowly and to understand correctly so you can write correctly and not be misled by them. But, once you begin to see these things it gets much ~~easily~~ easier and you come to anticipate them.

best, Harold

Curbstone picture: you can get the Archives to take the picture you want by telling them how close to get or how much to enlarge it. On the destruction of the spectro plate, the little and utterly undependable info we have is remote hearsay in CA 75-226 that the judge should never have accepted. But they also fear the FBI. Best way to have the FBI detest you is to display a lack of fear of it! Do not misunderstand this. I do not mean by showing contempt or being unpleasant or disagreeable. I never was even when as I rarely did I gave one or more of them hell. Just do not be unquestioning and do not ever take their unconfirmed work. They do lie all the time and they have their own ways of lying. But I've had one or two who were in strong opposition in the lawsuits tell me a few secrets and do that honestly. Depends on the individual. If you knew Farris Rockstall in Dallas before they fired him, I got the highest praises from him, in writing.